

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01131 01 OF 02 011322Z

43

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAM-01 SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-10 ACDA-19 IO-14 AEC-11 OIC-04

OMB-01 DRC-01 /162 W

----- 080546

R 011100Z FEB 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4350

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 1131

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: FEB 26 SPC DISCUSSION OF VERIFICATION AND RELATED
ACTIONS

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

REF: A) STATE 036927; B) STATE 027044

SUMMARY: DUE LACK OF FRG INSTRUCTIONS, WHICH FRG REP SAID WERE NOT
EXPECTED FOR AT LEAST ANOTHER WEEK, SPC COULD TAKE LITTLE ACTION
ON VERIFICATION PAPER AT ITS FEB 26 MEETING. IN EFFORT TO MOVE ON
ISSUES OF LESS DIRECT CONCERN TO FRG, DTUCH REP PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE
LANGUAGE FOR SECOND SENTENCE IN PARA 19, WHICH U.S. REP AGREED TO
REPORT TO WASHINGTON. SPC WILL HOLD OPEN MARCH 4 IN
HOPES THAT FRG MAY HAVE SOMETHING TO SAY. IN RELATED ACTION, U.S.
AND UK DELS INFORMALLY WORKED OUT COMPROMISE FORMULATIONS FOR PARAS
25 AND 30 WHICH BOTH AGREED TO FORWARD TO THEIR RESPECTIVE CAPITALS.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01131 01 OF 02 011322Z

ACTION REQUESTED: WASHINGTON CONCURRENCE WITH FORMULATIONS GIVEN
BELOW. END SUMMARY.

1. ASKED WHETHER FRG DELEGATION

COULD NOW AMPLIFY VIEWS MADE AT PREVIOUS MEETING, FRG REP (RANTZAU) SAID THAT BONN IS STILL STUDYING ENTIRE VERIFICATION QUESTION INTENSIVELY BUT THAT REVIEW WAS NOT YET COMPLETE. HE ASKED THE ALLIES TO UNDERSTAND THE DELAY SINCE ANY VERIFICATION PROPOSALS APPLIED ON NATO SIDE OF NGA WOULD PRIMARILY AFFECT FRG, AND THUS BONN NEEDED TO THINK THROUGH IMPLICATIONS IN GREAT DETAIL. FRG REP CONCLUDED THAT HE DID NOT EXPECT INSTRUCTIONS FOR AT LEAST ANOTHER WEEK.

2. CHAIRMAN THEREUPON PROPOSED TO HOLD OPEN MARCH 4 FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION ON VERIFICATION, BUT MEANTIME ASKED IF THE SPC COULD RESOLVE ANY OTHER PROBLEMS. DUTCH REP (SIZOO) PROPOSED ON PERSONAL BASIS COMPROMISE ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION FOR SECOND SENTENCE IN PARA 19. LANGUAGE READS: QTE THE ALLIES WILL SEEK TO ENSURE THAT THE INSPECTORATE TO BE ESTABLISHED TO VERIFY COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE WITHDRAWALS AND POST-REDUCTION FORCE LEVELS, WILL AT THE SAME TIME BE TASKED TO VERIFY, TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS ON THE LIMITATIONS OF MOVEMENTS AND ACTIVITIES OF U.S. AND SOVIET FORCES. UNQTE.

3. DUTCH REP FURTHER EXPLAINED THAT HIS FORMULATION MEANT TO HIGHLIGHT FACT THAT ALLIES WOULD NOT SEEK A SEPARATE INSPECTION SYSTEM FOR VERIFYING STABILIZING MEASURES. HE SAID THAT HE DID NOT LIKE PHRASE "TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE," BUT HAD KEPT IT IN TO REMIND THOSE ALLIES WHO MIGHT WISH TOTAL AND DETAILED VERIFICATION OF ALL MEASURES OF AN AGREEMENT THAT THERE WERE OBVIOUS PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS TO WHAT ANY INSPECTORATE COULD UNDERTAKE.

4. U.S. REP EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR DUTCH REP'S FORMULATION AND HIS

AMPLIFYING EXPLANATION, AND SAID HE WOULD REPORT ALNGUAGE TO HIS AUTHORITIES. HE ADDED, HOWEVER, THAT ALLIES SHOULD AGREE THAT THE

BASIC PURPOSE OF AN OVERT INSPECTION SYSTEM IS TO MONITOR WITHDRAWALS AND POST REDUCTIONS FORCE LEVELS, AND THAT WHILE THE SYSTEM MIGHT ALSO
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 01131 01 OF 02 011322Z

BE TASKED WITH MONITORING COMPLIANCE WITH STABILIZING MEASURES, SUCH ACTIVITY SHOULD NOT DETRACT FROM ITS PRIMARY TASK.

5. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) WELCOMED DUTCH FORMULATION, ADDING THAT IT WENT FAR TO ALLAY U.S. CONCERNS. ONLY BASIC DIFFICULTY HE HAD WAS WITH THE TERM "WILL SEEK TO" WHICH HE PROPOSED TO DELETE. HE EXPLAINED THAT ALLIES MAY WELL "SEEK TO" OBTAIN A VERIFICATION SYSTEM IN NEGOTIATIONS, ONCE ACHIEVED HOWEVER, ALLIES SHOULD AGREE THAT THEY WILL IN FACT HAVE THE RIGHT TO VERIFY COMPLIANCE WITH STABILIZING MEASURES. HE ALSO PREFERRED TO DELETE "TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE."

US. REP SUGGESTED THAT PERHAPS BELGIAN REP HAD

INTENDED DUTCH FORMULATION TO BE ONLY AN
INTERNAL ALLIED UNDERSTANDING AS TO WHAT INSPECTORS WOULD ACTUALLY
INSPECT. BELGIAN REP VIGOROUSLY DISAGREED, AND RECALLED BELGIUM'S
LONG STANDING VIEW THAT THERE BE A DE JURE RIGHT TO VERIFY STABILIZ-
ING MEASURES. IN THAT CASE, U.S. REP REPLIED, PHRASE "SEEK TO"
CLEARLY HAD TO REMAIN. HE ALSO BELIEVED "TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE"
TO BE ESSENTIAL. DUTCH REP RECALLED THAT HE HAD DELIBERATELY KEPT
PHRASE "SEEK TO" IN TO ACCOMMODATE "THOSE WHO NEEDED IT," AND
THEREFORE -BELGIAN OBJECTIONS NOTWITHSTANDING - STILL WISHED TO
RETAIN IT.

6. COMMENT: WE THINK DUTCH FORMULATION WITH U.S. COMMENT FOR RECORD
CORRESPONDS TO WASHINGTON'S VIEWS AS EXPRESSED IN PARA 2 OF REF A.
BELGIAN REP'S POSITION ON PHRASE IS A FAMILIAR ONE, WE WOULD,
HOWEVER, EXPECT HIM EVENTUALLY TO GO
ALONG WITH ANY STRONG CONSENSUS WHICH DEVELOPS, ESPECIALLY SINCE
DUTCH HAVE ALREADY DISAVOWED HIS ARGUMENT. END COMMENT

7. IN RELATED ACTION, U.S. AND UK DELS HAVE BEEN WORKING INFORMALLY
DURING PAST DAYS TO COME TO AN AGREEMENT ON THE MOBILE TEAM/STATIC
POSTS ISSUE (PARAS 25, 30 AND 38). WHILE BRITISH HAVE CONTINUED TO
STRESS DESIRABILITY OF A COMBINED SYSTEM, WE HAVE PRESSED ARGUMENT
THAT ALLIES MUST INSURE THAT THEY GET AT LEAST MOBILE TEAMS. IN
OUR DISCUSSIONS WE HAVE DRAWN ON PARA 7 OF REF B SUGGESTING TO THE
UK THAT ONCE MOBILE TEAMS ARE ACCEPTED THE ALLIES COULD THEN INTRO-
DUCE IDEA OF A LIMITED NUMBER OF STATIC POSTS. UK DEL IS READY TO
RECOMMEND THIS APPROACH TO LONDON, AS WELL AS OUR FURTHER ARGUMENT
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 01131 01 OF 02 011322Z

THAT PUTTING FORWARD MOBILE TEAMS IS BASED ON TACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

ON LATTER POINT, UK EXPANDED IDEA SUCH THAT OVERALL APPROACH IN
DESCRIBING COMPONENTS OF AN INSPECTORATE TO THE EAST WOULD BE
REAGRDED AS A TACTICAL QUESTION TO BE DECIDED IN THE LIGHT OF
NEGOTIATIONS. ALGHOUGH THIS APPROACH DOES NOT RESOLVE PROBLEM
SUBSTANTIVELY, WE THINK IT PRESERVES THE BASIC U.S.
POSITION ON PRIMACY OF MOBILE
TEAMS, WHILE ENABLING THE AHG TO DETERMINE HOW BEAST TO SUBMIT
AN OVERT VERIFICATION PROPOSAL.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 01131 02 OF 02 011347Z

43

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAM-01 SAJ-01 SS-20 NSC-10 ACDA-19 IO-14 AEC-11 OIC-04

OMB-01 DRC-01 /162 W

----- 080830

R 011100Z FEB 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 4351

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 1131

8. TEXT OF SUBSTITUTE PARAGRAPHS 25 AND 30, AS DEVELOPED BY UK DEL
AND AMENDED BY US, READS AS FOLLOWS:

QTE 25.FOR THE MONITORING OF WITHDRAWALS, THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE
OF ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD BE TO ACHIEVE A SYSTEM OF MOBILE TEAMS.
STATIC POSTS AT KEY POINTS SHOULD SUPPLEMENT SUCH A SYSTEM IF
POSSIBLE. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THAT IF IT
WERE NOT POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE A COMBINED SYSTEM, A SYSTEM OF MOBILE
TEAMS ALONE WOULD BE FAR PREFERABLE TO A SYSTEM OF STATIC
POSTS ALONE. THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE ELEMENTS OF A COMBINED
SYSTEM SHOULD BE PRESENTED TOGETHER, OR WHETHER ATTENTION SHOULD
INITIALLY BE FOCUSED ON MOBILE TEAMS, IS A TACTICAL ONE FOR
ALLIED NEGOTIATORS TO DECIDE. IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEGOTIATING
SITUATION.

30. FOR POST-WITHDRAWAL MONITORING, THE PRIMARY OBJECTIVE OF
ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD BE
A SYSTEM OF MOBILE TEAMS. STATIC POSTS AT KEY POINTS SHOULD SUPPLEMENT
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 01131 02 OF 02 011347Z

SUCH A SYSTEM IF POSSIBLE. SHOULD IT PROVE IMPOSSIBLE TO NEGOTIATE
A COMBINED SYSTEM, THEN MOBILE TEAMS ALONE WOULD BE A VERY MUCH
PREFERABLE ALTERNATIVE TO STATIC
POSTS ALONE (ALTHOUGH FROM THE MILITARY POINT OF VIEW ALONE, A SYSTEM
INVOLVING A REDUCED NUMBER OF MOBILE TEAMS WITH SOME STATIC POSTS
WOULD BE PREFERABLE TO A LARGER NUMBER OF EITHER MOBILE TEAMS OR
STATIC POSTS ON THEIR OWN). THE QUESTION OF WHETHER ALLIED
NEGOTIATORS SHOULD START BY PRESENTING A COMBINED SYSTEM AS A WHOLE
OR SHOULD INITIALLY CONCENTRATE ON MOBILE TEAMS, AS THE MOST
IMPORTANT SINGLE ELEMENT IN THE COMBINED SYSTEM, IS A TACTICAL
ISSUE TO BE DECIDED IN THE LIGHT OF THE OVERALL NEGOTIATING
SITUATION. UNQTE WE HAVE TOLD UK DEL THAT PARENTHETICAL STATEMENT
IN PARA 30 NOT LIKELY TO BE ACCEPTED BY WASHINGTON.

9. UK DEL HAS AGREED TO RECOMMEND FOREGOING TO LONDON AND WE HAVE
SAID WE WOULD DO LIKEWISE. BOTH DELS AGREED TO HOLD OFF ON PARA 38
UNTIL RESPECTIVE CAPITALS HAVE DECIDED ON FOREGOING LANGUAGE. CAN

WASHINGTON ACCEPT PROPOSED LANGUAGE FOR PARAS 25 AND 30 OR PROPOSE
ALTERNATIVE?

10. ON OTHER ISSUES WE WILL HAVE TO AWAIT FURTHER EXPLANATIONS OF
GERMAN POSITION. WE ARE TRANSMITTING SEPTTEL FOURTH
REVISION OF SPC'S DRAFT, WHICH INCORPORATES CHANGES AND NEW
BRACKETS
REPORTED IN USNATO 861.
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 FEB 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO01131
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740267/abbrytni.tel
Line Count: 227
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) STATE 036927; B) STATE 027044
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 19 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19-Jul-2001 by willialc>; APPROVED <30 APR 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: FEB 26 SPC DISCUSSION OF VERIFICATION AND RELATED ACTIONS
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
VIENNA
SALT TWO GENEVA
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005